NEW LOWER BOUND FORMULAS FOR MULTICOLORED RAMSEY NUMBERS

Aaron Robertson
Department of Mathematics, Colgate University, Hamilton, NY 13346
aaron@math.colgate.edu

arXiv:math/0107198v1 [math.CO] 27 Jul 2001

Abstract

We give two lower bound formulas for multicolored Ramsey numbers. These formulas improve the bounds for several small multicolored Ramsey numbers.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this short note we give two new lower bound formulas for the edgewise r-colored Ramsey numbers, $R(k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r)$. Both formulas are derived via construction.

We will make use of the following notation. Let G be a graph, $V(G)$ the set of vertices of G, and $E(G)$ the set of edges of G. An r-coloring, χ, will be assumed to be an edgewise coloring, i.e. $\chi(G) : E(G) \to \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$. If $u, v \in V(G)$, we take $\chi(u, v)$ to be the color of the edge connecting u and v in G. If we are considering the diagonal Ramsey numbers, i.e. $k_1 = k_2 = \ldots, k_r = k$, we will use $R_r(k)$ to denote the corresponding Ramsey number. It will also be helpful to make the following definition.

Definition. A *Ramsey r-coloring for $R = R(k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r)$* is an r-coloring of the complete graph on $V < R$ vertices which does not admit any monochromatic K_{k_j} subgraph of color j for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. For $V = R - 1$ we call the coloring a *maximal Ramsey r-coloring*.

2. THE LOWER BOUNDS

We start with a very trivial bound which nonetheless improves upon some current best lower bounds.

Theorem 1. *Let $r \geq 3$. For any $k_i \geq 3$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, we have*

$$R(k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r) > (k_1 - 1)(R(k_2, k_3, \ldots, k_r) - 1).$$

Proof. Let $\phi(G)$ be a maximal Ramsey $(r-1)$-coloring for $R(k_2, k_3, \ldots, k_r)$ with colors $2, 3, \ldots, r$. Let $k_1 \geq 3$. Let $G_i = G$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_1 - 1$. Let $v_i \in G_i$, $v_j \in G_j$ and define $\chi(H)$ as follows:

$$\chi(v_i, v_j) = \begin{cases} \phi(v_i, v_j) & \text{if } i = j \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

We now show that $\chi(H)$ is a Ramsey r-coloring for $R(k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r)$. For $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, r\}$, $\chi(H)$ does not admit any monochromatic K_{k_j} of color j by the definition of ϕ. Hence, we need only consider color 1. Since $\phi(G_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k_1 - 1$, is void of color 1, any monochromatic K_{k_1} of color 1 may only have one vertex in G_i for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k_1 - 1\}$. By the pigeonhole principle, however, there exists $I \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k_1 - 1\}$ such that G_I contains two vertices of K_{k_j}, a contradiction. □

Examples. Theorem 1 implies that $R_5(4) \geq 1372, R_5(5) \geq 7329, R_4(6) \geq 5346$, and $R_4(7) \geq 19261$, all of which beat the current best known bounds given in [Rad].

We now look at an off-diagonal bound.

Theorem 2. *Let $r \geq 3$. For any $3 \leq k_1 < k_2$, and $k_j \geq 3$, $j = 3, 4, \ldots, r$ we have*

$$R(k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r) > (k_1 + 1)(R(k_2 - k_1 + 1, k_3, \ldots, k_r) - 1).$$

Before giving the proof of this theorem, we have need of the following definition.

Defintion. We say that the $n \times n$ symmetric matrix $T = T(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ is a *Ramsey incidence matrix* if the r-coloring defined by $\chi : E(K_n) \to \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_r\}$, $\chi(i, j) = (i, j)$, is a Ramsey r-coloring. Furthermore, the color x_0 appears only on the diagonal of T (which we will denote $diag(T)$). Note that $T(x_0, x_2, x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_r)$ defines the same graph as $T(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_r)$ with colors x_1 and x_2 interchanged.

Proof of Theorem 2. We will construct an r-colored complete graph on $(k_1 + 1)(R(k_2 - k_1 + 1, k_3, \ldots, k_r) - 1)$ vertices which avoids monochromatic subgraphs K_{k_i} of color i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, by means of Ramsey incidence matrices. We start the proof with $R(t, k, l)$ and then generalize to an arbitrary number of colors.

Consider a maximal Ramsey 2-coloring for $R(k, l - t + 1)$. Let $T = T(x_0, x_1, x_2)$ denote the associated Ramsey incidence matrix. Define $A := T(\bullet, 2, 3)$, $B := T(3, 2, 1)$, and $C := T(1, 2, 3)$ and consider the symmetric $(t + 1) \times (t + 1)$ block matrix, H, below.

$$H = \begin{array}{ccccccc} A & & & & & & \\ B & A & & & & & \\ C & C & A & & & & \\ C & C & B & A & & & \\ C & C & B & B & A & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ C & C & B & B & \dots & B & A \end{array}$$

We will show that H contains no monochromatic K_t of color 1, no monochromatic K_k of color 2, and no monochromatic K_l of color 3, for $l \geq t+1$, to show that $R(t,k,l) > (t+1)(R(k,l-t+1)-1)$. To this end, we first look at the stucture of the edges of K_s in H. Without loss of generality we may assume that the entries in H representing the edges of K_s have the following structure, where $j_1 < i_1$.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \bullet(i_1,j_1) & & & & & \\ \bullet(i_2,j_1) & \bullet(i_2,i_1) & & & & \\ \bullet(i_3,j_1) & \bullet(i_3,i_1) & \bullet(i_3,i_2) & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \\ \bullet(i_{s-1},j_1) & \bullet(i_{s-1},i_1) & \bullet(i_s,i_2) & \dots & \bullet(i_{s-1},i_{s-2}) \end{array}$$

We will refer to two different types of rows below: entry rows and block rows. An entry row is a set $\{(i_q,j_r) : 1 \leq r \leq q\}$ were q is a fixed integer between 1 and $s-1$. A block row consists of one of the rows of H, for example the third block row is CCA. We will also use the term *relative position of* K_s several times. To determine the relative position of K_s, take all of the corresponding coordinates of K_s in H and reduce them modulo $(R(t,k,l)-1)$. This reduction gives us entries only in the $A(1,1)$ block in H. (When confusion may arise, we will use the full notation $A(i,j)$ to clarify which A (or B or C) block is being considered).

We will now show that the graph defined by the Ramsey incidence matrix H avoids the desired monochromatic subgraphs.

No monochromatic $\mathbf{K_t}$ of color 1. K_t cannot have two entry rows in any block row containing a C since $1 \in diag(C)$ and $1 \notin A$. Further, if two block rows both containing a C have entry rows in them, then since $1 \in diag(C)$ we must have $1 \in diag(B)$, a contradiction. Hence, $B(2,1)$ must have at least two entry rows. This implies that $1 \in A(2,2)$, a contradiction. Thus, we cannot have a monochromatic K_t of color 1.

No monochromatic $\mathbf{K_k}$ of color 2. If a monochromatic K_k of color 2 exists in H, then by taking the relative position, we would have a monochromatic K_k of color 2 in $A(1,1)$, contradicting the definition of A.

No monochromatic K_l of color 3. Assume, for a contradiction, that a monochromatic K_l of color 3 exists. If there are no entries in any B, then taking the relative position of all entries will imply that $A(1,1)$ contains a monochromatic K_l of color 3, a contradiction. Hence, we must have at least one entry in some B. However, each B may contain at most one entry since $3 \in diag(B)$. This implies that we can have at most one entry row in each block row 4 through $t+1$, and at most one entry column in the first block column. We now delete the first entry column, and the bottom $t-2$ entry rows. This deletion procedure assures us that none of the remaining entries lie in any B. Hence, we are left with $l-t$ entry rows, which form a K_{l-t+1}. By taking the relative position of these remaining entries, we have a monochromatic K_{l-t+1} of color 3 in $A(1,1)$, a contradiction.

To generalize the above argument to an arbitrary number of colors we change the definitions of A, B, and C; $A := T(0,2,3,4,5,\ldots,r)$, $B := T(3,2,1,4,5,\ldots,r)$, $C := T(1,2,3,4,5,\ldots,r)$. To see that there is no monochromatic K_{k_j} of color j for $j = 4,5,\ldots,r$ see the argument for no monochromatic K_k of color 2 above. □

Example. Theorem 2 implies that $R(3,3,3,11) \geq 437$, beating the previous best lower bound of 433.

REFERENCES

[Rad] S. Radziszowski, Small Ramsey numbers, *El. J. Comb.*, DS1 (revision #7, 2000), 36pp.

[Ram] F. Ramsey, On a problem of formal logic, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **30** (1930), 264-286.

[Rob] A. Robertson, *Ph.D. thesis*, Temple University, 1999.